

REMARKS

Claim 1 is currently pending in the application. The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 4,177,935 (Centanni) in view of US Patent No 3,228,710 (Chodorowski). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R 1.116, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

Applicant respectfully submits that Centanni, alone or in combination with Chodorowski, fails to disclose, teach or even remotely suggest the present invention. Neither Centanni nor Chodorowski, alone or in combination teach the limitations of claim 1. Specifically, the cited reference do not teach the limitation of "interposing a relief region along the score line, said relief region including a plurality of arranged cuts that lie substantially transverse the score line."

The Office Action indicated that the container of Centanni does not disclose a relief region including a plurality of arranged cuts lie substantially transverse the score line. Applicant agrees with this assertion. Centanni teaches using slots 76 and 78 to allow the box to fold square corners (col 3: ln 60-65). Centanni is not concerned with lateral movement along the fold line. To this end Centanni removes the container material in the region of the fold.

As an initial matter, Chodorowski is not concerned with container formation at all. Rather Chodorowski is concerned with folding paper, not container material. Additionally, Chodorowski is expressly concerned with movement of the paper along the fold line. Specifically, Chodorowski states that "perforation or slits according to the present invention allow the section to move laterally during the folding operation" (col 4: lns 64-66). To accomplish this, Chodorowski cuts slits across a fold line (figs 1 & 2).

The cited art lacks motivation to combine. Specifically, Centanni is merely concerned with being able to fold square corners in a container and is not concerned with the lateral movement of the panels along the fold line. Quite to the contrary, providing lateral movement

along the fold line is expressly the problem Chodorowski attempts to solve. As such, there is no motivation, either expressly or inherently in the cited art to combine their respective teachings.

Further, the teaching of the suggested combination can not be combined. Specifically, Centanni completely removes the material in the relief section. Conversely, Chodorowski provided slits in the relief region. It is not fair to even suggest placing slits in material in an area where the material does not even exist.

As the cited art fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the present application, the obvious based rejection must be removed. As such, Applicant respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claim. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if there are any remaining issues.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY



Daniel J. Beitey

Registration No. 48,626

Direct Dial No. 253-924-3685